

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

JOSHUA LAMBERT,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIRIAM KASTLE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C22-5470-RAJ-SKV

ORDER RE-NOTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS TO EXTEND TIME AND
DIRECTING A RESPONSE

This is a civil rights action proceeding under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motions for a 90-day extension to file a response to Defendants' pending summary judgment motion. Dkts. 29, 30. Plaintiff noted his motions as "Same Day Motions" under Local Civil Rule (LCR) 7(d)(1), but motions for extension of time do not fall within the scope of that rule. *See* LCR 7(d)(1). The Clerk's Office thereafter attempted to correct this error, but improperly noted the motions as "Second Friday Motions" under LCR 7(d)(2).¹ Given the confusion surrounding the noting dates of Plaintiff's motions, and given that the extension requested by Plaintiff is lengthy and a response from Defendants would benefit the Court in

¹ Pursuant to LCR 7(d)(7), LCR 7(d)(2) does not apply in cases involving prisoners.

ORDER RE-NOTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS TO EXTEND TIME AND
DIRECTING A RESPONSE - 1


1 resolving Plaintiff's motions, the Court will re-note Plaintiff's motions and direct that
2 Defendants file a response thereto.

3 Based on the foregoing, the Court hereby ORDERS as follows:

4 (1) Plaintiff's motions to extend the deadline for filing a response to Defendants'
5 summary judgment motion (Dkts. 29, 30) are RE-NOTED for consideration on *August 25, 2023*.
6 Defendants are directed to file a response to Plaintiff's motions not later than *August 21, 2023*.

7 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff, to counsel for
8 Defendants, and to the Honorable Richard A. Jones.

9 DATED this 9th day of August, 2023.

10
11 

12 S. KATE VAUGHAN
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23